

## **REMARKS**

The foregoing amendments are *identical* to the amendments submitted on May 12, 2005, which the Advisory Action mailed June 17, 2005 stated clearly defined over the prior art. That Advisory Action, however, alleged that these amendments raised new issues with respect only to verification of the satisfaction of 35 U.S.C. § 112 issues. While the undersigned continues to disagree with the Office Action's substantive rejections of the previous claims, rather than incur the additional \$500 fee and time delay associated with an appeal, the undersigned has opted to file this RCE.

### **Teleconference with Examiner Wong**

The undersigned wishes to thank Examiner Wong for taking the time to discuss this matter by phone on July 18, 2005. The undersigned wanted clarification that, if this amendment were presented (identical to the previously submitted amendment), that the claims would not be rejected over the prior art of record. Examiner Wong confirmed that the claim amendments clearly defined the claims over the prior art of record.

It should be understood, therefore, that the undersigned submits these amendments (and has incurred the expense of this RCE) on the express representation of Examiner Wong that the claims, as amended herein, clearly define over the prior art of record. In view of the fact that this application was subject to both an original search and a supplemental search (after a first amendment), it is not expected that any further searching should identify any more pertinent prior art.

A credit card authorization form is submitted herewith for the filing fee associated with this RCE.

No additional fee is believed to be due in connection with this submission.

Respectfully Submitted,

By:   
**Daniel R. McClure; Reg. No. 38,962**

3310 Cranmore Chase  
Marietta, GA 30066  
(678) 560-5937